artdaq - Idea #24375

Look into possible performance improvements due to using byte as the basic Fragment data type

05/04/2020 01:40 PM - Eric Flumerfelt

Status:	New	Start date:	05/04/2020
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:		% Done:	0%
Category:		Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:			
Experiment:	-		

Description

In a recent DUNE Application Framework meeting, it came up that many kernel components and system libraries are optimized to deal with bytes as opposed to long words. We should investigate if there are any performance improvements if the artdaq Fragment RawDataType is a uint8 t instead of a uint64 t.

History

#1 - 05/04/2020 01:41 PM - Eric Flumerfelt

I've made a minimal set of changes to artdaq-core to make Fragment use uint8_t as RawDataType on artdaq-core:feature/24375_RawDataType_ByteTest

#2 - 05/05/2020 03:05 PM - Eric Flumerfelt

I have added branches to artdaq (feature/24375_ByteTest_FixesForArtdaq) and artdaq-utilities-daqinterface (feature/24375_ByteTest_SettingsForByteTest) which have some changes needed for the demo system to work with byte-based Fragments.

#3 - 05/19/2020 04:43 PM - Ron Rechenmacher

Latest tests seem to show that there is no difference when writing ROOT files: Baseline:

```
/home/ron/work/artdagPrj/demo4-e19-s96
ron@mu2edaq13 :^) for xx in `seq 3`;do date;time taskset -c 20 artdaqDriver -c srcs/artdaq_demo/tools/fcl/test
_10Mx30000_root3null.fcl | wc -1;done
Tue May 19 12:28:25 CDT 2020
152
real 3m1.645s
       2m58.651s
user
sys
       0m1.270s
Tue May 19 12:31:27 CDT 2020
159
real 3m7.640s
        3m0.215s
user
        0m6.134s
sys
Tue May 19 12:34:35 CDT 2020
152
       3m1.612s
real
        2m59.160s
user
       0m1.446s
--2020-05-19_12:37:36--
```

With byte array (via issue 24375 branches:

```
/home/ron/work/artdaqPrj/demo1-e19-s96-24375_ByteTest-artdaqDriver-null
ron@mu2edaq13 :^) for xx in `seq 3`;do date;time taskset -c 20 artdaqDriver -c srcs/artdaq_demo/tools/fcl/test
_10Mx30000_root3null.fcl | wc -l;done
Tue May 19 14:09:48 CDT 2020

real    3m2.602s
user    2m59.784s
sys    0m1.210s
```

02/25/2021 1/2

Tue May 19 14:12:51 CDT 2020 152

real 3m1.703s user 2m59.410s sys 0m1.297s

Tue May 19 14:15:52 CDT 2020

159

real 3m1.649s user 2m59.495s sys 0m1.264s --2020-05-19_14:18:54--

02/25/2021 2/2